



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/047,502

11/13/2001

Masahiko Sato

450100-03617

3958

20999 7590 07/11/2008
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG
745 FIFTH AVENUE- 10TH FL.
NEW YORK, NY 10151

EXAMINER

SHANG, ANNAN Q

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2623

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/11/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/047,502	Applicant(s) SATO ET AL.	
	Examiner ANNAN Q. SHANG	Art Unit 2623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 April 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4,5,7-18,21-31,33-35 and 37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4,5,7-18,21-31,33-35 and 37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-18, 21-31, 33-35 and 37 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

With respect to claims 1-5, 7-8, 10, 14-19, 21-22, 24 and 28-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Russo (5,619,247)** in view of **Shah-Nazaroff et al (6,157,377)** and the various 103(a) rejection of the last office action, applicant amends claims and argues that the prior arts of record do not teach the amended claim limitation (see page 12 of 15 of applicant's Remarks/Arguments).

In response, Examiner disagrees. Examiner notes Applicant arguments, however, Russo teaches media format conversion to convert into a plurality of media format types, i.e. audio information including video, as audio only, applying simply high quality sound, including stereo sound, whether analog or digital form, audio information (musical selection, etc.,) where the information is recorded on disk drive and other recording medium and further discloses digital monitors for accepting video inputs or TV receivers (analog or digital (col.5, lines 48-65, col.6, line 63-col.7, line 22, lines 35-61, col.8, lines 10-54 and col.9, line 38-col.10, line 1+). Furthermore **Shah-Nazaroff** discloses a client with various types of display devices attached to the client (fig.6). Hence Applicant's amendments do not overcome the prior arts of record. The amendment to the claims necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection discussed below.

This office action is made final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 14-18, 21-22, 24 and 28-31, 33-35 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Russo (5,619,247)** in view of **Shah-Nazaroff et al (6,157,377)**.

As to claims 1, 2 and 4, note the **Russo** reference figures 1-2, discloses stored program pay-per-play and further discloses an information recording apparatus comprising:

Information recording means (Controller 'C' 10) for recording information in a first recording medium (Storage 'S' 14 or 110) and information storing means (figs.1, 2, col.3, line 40-col.4, line 27 and line 45-col.5, line 10);

Operation means (C-10) for operating unloading of the first recording medium the information recorded by the first recording means (col.4, line 45-col.5, line 10 and col.6, lines 33-53);

Unloading means (C-10) for unloading the first recording medium based on the operation of the operation means (col.4, line 45-col.5, line 10 and col.6, lines 33-53);
and

Fee charging means (C-10) for charging when the first recording medium is unloaded by the unloading means, and selecting means for selecting quality of the

information to be stored in the first recording medium by the information recording means; where the fee charging means varies the amount of fee that is charged according to the quality selected by the selecting means and dubbing information stored in the first recording medium prior to the unloading and charging information means for storing in a memory the varied amount of fees that are charged and for reproducing and transmitting, subsequent to the unloading, the amount of fee that is charged for the information that is unloaded." (col.6, lines 34-53, line 63-col.7, line 23, col.9, line 51-col.10, lines 10-21 and line 39+).

Russo further discloses where the information recording means includes a medium format conversion means to convert the information into one of a plurality of media format types of information, a disc drive to record the information for a disc reproducing apparatus and a memory device to record the information for a portable telephone adapted to reproduce the information on a display on the telephone (col.5, lines 48-65, col.6, line 63-col.7, line 22, lines 35-61, col.8, lines 10-54 and col.9, line 38-col.10, line 1+);

Russo teaches storing different quality based upon input criteria, but silent to where the dubbing comprises status information transmitted for conversion prior to unloading.

However, note the **Shah-Nazaroff** reference figures 1-6, discloses method and apparatus for purchasing upgraded media features for programming transmissions, transmits status information to the client prior to unloading and enables a user selected

upgrade or quality of media, to be applied to the media before unloading (col.2, line 18-col.3, line 1+, col.4, line 16-col.5, line 1+ and col.6, lines 15-48).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teaching of Shah-Nazaroff into the system of Russo to provide the user an opportunity to select affordable service based on image quality, sound or audio quality, etc.

As to claim 5, Russo further disclose notifying means for notifying charging of fee when unloading operation is performed through the operating means (col.4, line 45-col.5, line 10 and col.6, lines 33-53).

Claims 7-8, 10 and 14 are met as previously discussed with respect to claim 1.

As to claim 15-18, the claimed "A charging method for charging a fee related to an information recording..." is composed of the same structural elements that were discussed with respect to the rejection of claims 1-2.

Claims 21-22, 24 and 28 are met as previously discussed with respect to claim 1.

As to claims 29-31, the claimed "An information recording apparatus comprising..." is composed of the same structural elements that were discussed with respect to the rejection of claims 1-3.

As to claims 33-35, the claimed "A charging method for charging a fee related to an information recording apparatus..." is composed of the same structural elements that were discussed with respect to the rejection of claims 1-3.

As to claim 37, Russo further discloses where the charge information means stores a prepaid fee in the memory, the prepaid fee being reduced as the fee charging

means charges the fee; the fee charging means charges the fee until the prepaid fee is exhausted, whereupon the unloading means no longer unloads the first recording medium (col.4, line 45-col.5, line 10, lines 48-65, col.6, lines 33-53 and col.10, lines 10+).

4. Claims 9, 11 and 23, 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Russo (5,619,247)** in view of **Shah-Nazaroff et al (6,157,377)** as applied to claims 1 and 15 above, and further in view of **Hershtik et al (5,790,236)**.

As to claims 9 and 11, Russo as modified by Shah-Nazaroff, fail to explicitly teach where the quality of the information is based on number of languages and region code.

However, **Hershtik** teaches processing movies based on frame characteristics of the language and audio format, such as French, German, Italian, English, etc., all of which includes its region code (col.4, lines 50-65, col.6, line 61-col.7, line 55 and col.14, lines 31-67).

Therefore it would have obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teaching Hershtik into the system of Russo as modified by Shah-Nazaroff in order to process image quality based on the language, audio and region code as selected by a user, to enable the information provider to meet various user preferences and charge a fee accordingly for these services.

Claims 23 and 25 are met as previously discussed with respect to claims 9 and 11.

5. Claims 12-13 and 26-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Russo (5,619,247)** in view of **Shah-Nazaroff et al (6,157,377)** as applied to claims 1 and 15 above, and further in view of **Eyer et al (6,588,015)**.

As to claim 12-13, Russo as modified by Shah-Nazaroff, fail to explicitly teach selecting to recording of commercial message along with the information, where reducing the amount of charge when recording of the commercial message is selected.

However, note the **Eyer** reference, discloses various methods of reducing fees based on a user specific preferences related to commercials or ads (col.6, lines 50-61 and col.16, line 28-col.17, line 1+).

Therefore it would have obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teaching of Eyer into the system of Russo as modified by Shah-Nazaroff to enable a user to select desirable and affordable service and for the information provide to charge an appropriate fee based on the user's preference.

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Annan Q. Shang** whose telephone number is **571-272-7355**. The examiner can normally be reached on **700am-400pm**.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Christopher S. Kelley** can be reached on **571-272-7331**. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is **571-273-8300**.

Art Unit: 2623

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the **Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free)**. If you would like assistance from a **USPTO Customer Service Representative** or access to the automated information system, **call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000**.

/Annan Q Shang/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2623

Annan Q. Shang